REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed October 3, 2003 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 3 and 10 are canceled by this amendment. Claims 1, 4, 7, 11, 12, 13, 24, 26, 28, and 30 have been amended and claims 35-44 have been added herein. Claims 1-2, 4-23, 32, 33, and 35-44 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 12, and 24 being the only independent claims. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action mailed October 3, 2003, claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,810,680 (Lobb) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,062,991 (Moriarty) and U.S. Patent No. 6,117,013 (Eiba).

Independent claims 1 and 12

The present invention relates to a method and system for transmitting sports data between a mobile terminal, such as a mobile phone shown in Fig. 3, and a sports database in a sports server. The mobile terminal accesses the sports server through a public mobile communication network. Independent claims 1 and 12, respectively drawn to a method and a system for transmitting sport data between a mobile terminal and a sport server, have each been amended to clarify that the sport server determines a type of mobile terminal and at least display parameters of the mobile terminal such that the sport server selects a prompt display for the mobile terminal based on the determined display parameters of the mobile terminal. Support for these limitations is found in the specification at page 6, lines 2-5, and at page 11, lines 10-16. Independent claims 1 and 12 have also been amended to further recite that the sports server transmits sport data to an output device which has requested the sport data and that the sport data is adapted to a desired format for the output device by a designated filter adapting device.

Support for this amendment is found in the specification at page 12, lines 13-14, and at page 13, lines 3-7.

It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 12, as amended, are allowable over Lobb in view of Moriarty and Eiba, because these references fail to teach or suggest (1) that the sport server determines a type of mobile terminal used and display parameters of the mobile terminal and that the sports server selects a prompt display to be communicated to the mobile terminal based on the determined display parameters of the mobile terminal, and (2) that the sport server transmits the sport data from the sport server to an output device which has requested the sport data, and wherein the sport data is adapted to a desired format for the output device by a dedicated filter.

Regarding the first reason, Lobb discloses a computer aided game apparatus in which a mobile unit is used for recording data, i.e., golf scores, during the play of the game. The mobile unit is specifically designed for processing golf data (see col. 4, lines 56-59, of Lobb). After the game is complete, the mobile unit of Lobb may be connected to a computer station 150 located of the field or course for uploading and downloading the golf scores already recorded on the mobile unit (see col. 8, lines 1-11, and Fig. 2A).

Moriarty discloses a method and apparatus for communication, calculation, and recording keeping for golf courses. According to Moriarty, a golfer inputs data to a golfer's interface at each hole of a golf course. The interface may be arranged at each hole or it may be arranged in the golf cart. The golfer's interface 300 sends the data in real time to a manager's interface 200 using a golf course-specific radio interface that is used at each golf course between the golfer's interface and the managers's interface (see col. 5, lines 31-38 of Moriarty).

Lobb and Moriarty disclose systems that use golf course-specific radio communication systems. The input devices used by the golfers to input data are designed as part of the overall system. Since all parts of the systems of Lobb and Moriarty are designed to work with each other, there is no need for the central computer to determine the type of input device and the display characteristics thereof. Accordingly, Lobb and Moriarty fail to teach or suggest that the sport server determines a type of mobile terminal and at least display parameters of the mobile terminal such that the sport server selects a prompt display for the mobile terminal based on the determined display parameters of the mobile terminal, as recited in independent claims 1 and 12.

Eiba also fails to teach or suggest anything related to the determination of the type of the device in communication with the server. Eiba discloses a game device system in which multiple users, each having a game device, connect to a centralized computer for simultaneous participation in a game. More specifically, Eiba discloses a game device for playing an electronic lottery type game in which users contact the control computer using various types of game devices such as mobile phones, personal computers, and lap tops (see col. 2, lines 40-61 of Eiba). The only requirement discussed in Eiba regarding the display is that the display can output the winning numbers of the game (see col. 2, lines 30-36; col. 4, lines 21-27; and col. 4, lines 32-36). Eiba discloses that the display must meet some minimum requirements so that it can output the winning symbol combination (see especially col. 2, lines 30-36). Instead of determining the display characteristics of each input device, Eiba discloses that each input device meets a minimum requirement which ensures that the required information can be displayed.

In Paper No. 16, the Examiner states "While it is implied that Eiba has some means of distinguishing between the various input devices and transmitting data accordingly,

Eiba is silent on the explicit disclosure of storing data pertaining to the different types of devices and determining a type of device in communication with the server." The Examiner then states that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a connection database and the determination of the input device type into Eiba to ensure that data is transmitted in the most effective manner to all the different types of input devices."

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's position and respectfully submit it is not implied in Eiba that there is some means of distinguishing between the various input devices. Rather, Eiba teaches that the communicated data between the device and the server is simplified into very basic numbers or symbols and requires that the display of the input device meet some minimum requirements, thus ensuring that the information can be displayed. By requiring that all mobile terminal used in the system of Eiba meet a minimum requirement, Eiba teaches that a determination of a device type or display parameters of the mobile terminal is not required because all of the mobile terminals which meet the minimum requirements are capable of displaying the data.

Since the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest that the sport server determines a type of mobile terminal used and at least display parameters thereof and selects a prompt display to be communicated to the mobile terminal based on the determined display parameters of the mobile terminal, independent claims 1 and 12 are allowable over Lobb in view of Moriarty and further in view of Eiba.

Regarding the second reason, independent claims 1 and 12 further recite that the sport server transmits the sport data from the sport server to an output device which has requested the sport data, and wherein the sport data is adapted to a desired format for the output

device by a dedicated filter. This aspect of the invention is described in the specification at page 12, line 13 to page 13, line 11.

Lobb and Moriarty fail to teach or suggest this limitation. As stated above, both Lobb and Moriarty disclose systems that use golf course-specific radio communication systems. Any input devices and output devices are designed as part of the overall system, thus obviating the requirement for adapting the data. Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion for transmitting the sport data from the sport server to an output device which has requested the sport data, and adapting the sport data to a desired format for the output device by a filter adapting device, as recited in independent claims 1 and 12.

Eiba also fails to teach or suggest this limitation. As described above, Eiba discloses that any display used to output the results must meet some minimum requirements. Accordingly, instead of determining characteristics of an output device and filtering the information sent thereto, Eiba merely ensures that the display meets a minimum requirement, thus ensuring that the displays of all mobile terminals used have the minimum capabilities required to properly display the data. Accordingly, Lobb in view of Moriarty and Eiba fail to teach or suggest adapting the sport data to a desired format for the output device by a filter adapting device, as recited in independent claims 1 and 12.

For this additional reason, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 12 are allowable over Lobb in view of Moriarty and further in view of Eiba.

Independent claim 24

Independent claim 24 is drawn to a mobile terminal for transmitting sports data to a sports server and has been amended to recite that the mobile terminal indicates to the sports server display parameters of a display on the mobile terminal to ensure that a prompt received

from the sports server is suitable for viewing on the mobile terminal display. Support for this limitation is found at page 6, lines 2-5 and page 10, lines 10-12. This portion of the specification discloses that the sports server determines the type of mobile terminal being used and the display characteristics thereof. To accomplish this determination, there must be some indication from the mobile terminal regarding the type of mobile terminal and the display characteristics.

As described above, Lobb and Moriarty disclose systems that use golf course-specific radio communication systems and any input devices would be designed as part of the overall system, thereby obviating any need to identify the characteristics thereof. Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion for indicating display characteristics of the mobile terminal to the sport server, as recited in independent claim 24. In contrast, such characteristics would be taken into account in the design of the golf course-specific systems of Lobb and Moriarty.

Eiba also fails to teach or suggest that a mobile terminal indicates display parameters to the sports server. Eiba discloses that any display used to output the results must meet some minimum requirements. Accordingly, instead of determining characteristics of a mobile terminal and tailoring the characteristics of the information sent thereto, Eiba merely ensures that the display meets a minimum requirement, thereby ensuring that the data can be displayed. Accordingly, Lobb in view of Moriarty and Eiba fail to teach or suggest indicating to the sports server at least display parameters of said display of the mobile terminal, thereby ensuring that a prompt received from the sports server is suitable for viewing on said display, as recited in independent claim 24.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 24 is allowable over Lobb in view of Moriarty and Eiba.

Dependent claims

Dependent claims 2, 4-9, and 11-44, each being dependent on one of independent claims 1, 12, and 24, are deemed allowable for the same reasons expressed above with respect to independent claims 1, 12, and 24.

New dependent claims 35, 36, 39, 40, 43, and 44 recite specific display parameters of the mobile terminal which may be used by the sport server to determine the prompt display to transmit to the mobile terminal. Support for these limitations is at page 11, lines 12-16 in the specification. Neither Lobb, Moriarty, nor Eiba disclose these specific display parameters. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 35, 36, 39, 40, 43, and 44 are allowable for these additional reasons.

New dependent claims 37 and 41 recite that only a portion of the output data passes through the filter adapting device based on the desired format of the output device. Support for this limitation is found on page 13, lines 6-7. Neither Lobb, Moriarty, nor Eiba disclose a filter adapting device for selectively allowing output information therethrough based on what is required or permitted to a user. Accordingly, dependent claim 37 and 41 are allowable for these additional reasons.

New dependent claims 38 and 42 recite that location information of the user is received by the sport server from a public cellular network. Support for this limitation is found on page 6, lines 7-8. Neither Lobb, Moriarty, nor Eiba disclose that the location of the user is determined by a public cellular network. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 38 and 42 are allowable for these additional reasons.

The application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is solicited.

A check in the amount of $144.00 is enclosed in payment for the addition of 8 new claims in excess of 20. If any additional fees or charges are required at this time they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By _____

Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: February 3, 2004